

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The office action of May 31, 2005 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 10, 11, and 20 have been amended to further clarify the scope of the claims. Claims 1-3, 9-13, 18-27, and 30-35 thus remain pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 9, 18-27, 30, 31, 34, and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *LaStrange et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,784,058, hereinafter *LaStrange*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “displaying a first document context which is the subject of a single navigational focus; displaying a second document context simultaneously with the first document context while maintaining the single navigational focus.” To show these features of claim 1, the action relies on FIG. 5 and col. 5, lines 25-45 of *LaStrange*. The Action alleges that Figure 5 illustrates a sticky page feature, which maintains a current display page of a web browser and creates a second display page to which there is a shift in the navigational focus. However, *LaStrange* does not teach or suggest a single navigational focus as claimed. Rather *LaStrange* describes a multi-space navigational environment, which applicants have distinguished in the Background of Invention section of the specification.

To support the conclusion that *LaStrange* teaches a single navigational focus, the Action relies on an independent interpretation of the term “single navigational focus.” Specifically, the Action states that “the broad nature of the term ‘*navigational focus*,’ without any further description of how the ‘navigational focus’ is generated or what the ‘navigational focus’ provides, other than two pages on the same display, leaves such a term open to interpretation based on the claim language.” Yet, the Applicants’ original written description provides examples of a single navigational focus, including one example which provides that “[i]n a user interface with a single navigational focus, there is only one set of navigational controls, there is no duplication of these controls on the screen, and there is only one frame at a time on which all navigational controls will act.” (Original written description, page 5, lines 12-15).

In contrast, Figure 5 of *LaStrange* illustrates the creation of a second browser window with a duplicate and separate set of navigational controls. Though the first and second browser windows are simultaneously displayed, they are not subject to a single navigational focus. Instead, each web browser is provided with its own independent set of navigational controls, creating a multi-navigational focus architecture. As such, *LaStrange* fails to teach or suggest a single navigational focus. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the present rejection.

Dependent claims 2-3 and 30-31, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons as their ultimate base claim, and further in view of the additional features recited therein.

Independent claim 9 recites, similar to claim 1, “displaying a first document context which is the subject of a single navigational focus; displaying a second document context simultaneously with the first document context while maintaining the single navigational focus.” Claim 9 is thus allowable for similar reasons as claim 1, discussed above.

Claims 18 and 19, similar to claim 1, recite “displaying a first document context which is the subject of a single navigational focus; displaying a second document context simultaneously with the first document context while maintaining the single navigational focus.” Therefore, claims 18 and 19 are allowable for similar reasons as claim 1.

Claim 20, similar to claim 1, recites “displaying a first document context which is the subject of a single navigational focus;...in response to the page pinning signal, displaying at least a portion of the first context as a pinned page overlaid on the first context while maintaining the single navigational focus;...displaying a second document context within the single navigational focus.” As discussed with respect to claim 1, *LaStrange* fails to teach or suggest a single navigational focus.

Dependent claims 21-27 and 34-35 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 20, as well as based on the additional features recited therein. For example, with respect to claim 24, *LaStrange* fails to teach or suggest “displaying a document comprising at least one command in response to a command document display signal input by a user.” The Office Action cites *LaStrange*, col. 5, lines 33-36 as describing this feature. However, this portion of *LaStrange* merely indicates that each window in the multi-window navigational structure has a page pinning

feature. This is not the same as displaying a document comprising at least one command in response to a command document display signal input by a user as recited in claim 24. Indeed, *LaStrange* does not teach or suggest the use of a command document display signal.

With respect to claim 26, *LaStrange* does not teach or suggest that the page pinning signal is initiated automatically in response to the input of the command document display signal. Instead, *LaStrange* describes loading a web page by overriding the currently displayed web page, which is not the same as page pinning being automatically initiated in response to the input of the command document display signal as recited in claim 26.

With respect to claim 27, *LaStrange* does not teach or suggest selecting a region in the first document context in which a command is to be performed.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10-13, 32, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *LaStrange* in view of Fagioli (U.S. Pat. No. 6,710,790, hereinafter *Fagioli*). Applicants respectfully traverse.

As described above with reference to Applicants' claim 1, *LaStrange* fails to teach or suggest a single navigational focus, which is similarly found in Applicants' claims 10-13, 32, and 33. *Fagioli* fails to cure this deficiency of *LaStrange*. Thus, the claims are allowable for substantially the same reasons as claim 1 and further in view of the novel features therein.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 31st day of August, 2005

By:


John M. Fleming, Registration No. 56,536

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001

JMF/lis